Mr. Charles Davis
MS Gulf State Community College
2226 Switzer Road
Gulfport, MS 39508-3894

10/11/96

Dear Mr. David,

Thanks for the pages from David Fisher's Hard Evidence, of which I'd not heard. I've highlighted them in the event of future reference but believe that at best it is worthless and much of it is absolutely, without question, false and was known to be false by those quoted FBI agents. There is not a relevant word from them that would stand up under court examination. Not even on their shooting. What Frazier is quoted as saying is refuted by what he swore to. And as you'll see to a limited degree in Post Mortem and in greater detail in NEVER AGAIN! the best shots the NRA could provide, under improved conditions and with the rifle overhauled, could not duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald. Frazier did testify that one time, firing from the prone position with the rifle overhauled and after practising with the defective sight, at 25 feet he got one shot off in 2.3 seconds. That means from the time of the shot and does not include sighting, etc.

There is no question about it at all, and Frazier admitted to knowing it when we deposed him underoath, the damage to the shirt collar and tie was not from any bullet. That was impossible, despite what Fisher quotes from them. It was from a scalpel.

The stuff on Oswald's prints is dishonest. He worked in those boxes that very morning so they had to be fresh. But not one was where he'd have touched a box to move it. Or lift it.

It is a lie to say that found the fragments from the head shot. The prosector testified that the X-rays showed 40 dust-like fragments there. That bullet exploded. With a big shunk remaining at the back of the head. What they found they presumed was two fairly large size fragments they assume was from that shot but there is no evidence that it was and there was opportunity to plant them and more. The actual evidence is that Oswald could not have fired that rifle that day. I mean the actual and lied-about official evidence.

They also lie about the marginal matwrial in the Zapruder film, as you'll find in Whitewash II, which dates to 1966.

What is interesting, and I'll be sending copies of this to some professors who might make FOIA requests or get students to do that, is what was withheld from me in lawsuits in which it should have been given to me. One page 264 Robert Frazier is quoted as saying that Hoover required him to read and annotate the earlier books. They withheld that.

Thanks and best wishes,

Harold Weisberg Harold Weisberg